

RAY K. SHAHANI
ATTORNEY AT LAW



Twin Oaks Office
477 Ninth Avenue, Suite 112
San Mateo, California 94402-1854

Registered Patent Attorney - Technology and Intellectual Property Matters
<http://www.attycubed.com>

#61A RC
10/31/02
Harges

Telephone: (650) 348-1444
Facsimile: (650) 348-8655
e-mail: rks@attycubed.com

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:) **AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE TO PAPER NO. 4**
PATON) **MAILED 07/15/02**
Serial No.: 09/680,286)
Filing Date: October 6, 2000) Date Mailed: October 14, 2002
Attorney Docket No.: ENP-101)
Title: REMOTE MONITORING)
OF CRITICAL PARAMETERS)
FOR CALIBRATION OF)
MANUFACTURING)
EQUIPMENT AND)
FACILITIES)
Examiner: NOLAND, Thomas P.
Group Art Unit: 2856

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE TO PAPER NO. 4 MAILED 07/15/02

Dear Sir,

Applicant is in receipt of Paper No. 4 mailed 07/15/02. Thank you for your continued expedient examination of the present Application.

STATEMENT OF CLAIMS STATUS

Claims 1-17 are pending.

Claims 1-7 and 9-17 are rejected.

Claims 8 is objected to.

RECEIVED
OCT 28 2002
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Amendment and Response to Paper No. 4 Mailed 07/15/02

Filing Date: October 6, 2000

Date Mailed: October 14, 2002

Title: REMOTE MONITORING OF CRITICAL PARAMETERS FOR
CALIBRATION OF MANUFACTURING EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES

Serial No.: 09/680,286

Attorney Docket No.: ENP-101

SUMMARY OF RESPONSE

Detailed Action

1. Examiner states: "The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02. The oath or declaration is defective because: It does not identify the city and either state or foreign country of residence of each inventor. The residence information may be provided on either on an application data sheet or supplemental oath or declaration. It does not identify the mailing or post office address of each inventor. A mailing or post office address is an address at which an inventor customarily receives his or her mail and may be either a home or business address. The mailing or post office address should include the ZIP code designation. The mailing or post office address may be provided on an application data sheet or a supplemental oath or declaration. See 37 CFR 1.63(c) and 37 CFR 1.76. Note the city of residence is believed to be Morgan Hill, not 498 Rio Grande. Applicant is also reminded of the full given name requirement in the event a middle initial was omitted."
2. Examiner states: "The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The initial page 1 should be canceled and if desired the referred to patents described in the background art section on page 1 of the specification. Appropriate correction is required."
3. Examiner states: "The drawings are objected to because Fig. 1 should be legended — Prior Art — Fig. 4 should be redrawn to illustrate 22 as a box element legended — Wireless Receiving Module — elements 13 and 14 shown as distinct elements and element 20 shown as a conventional representation of a battery or as a box labeled — battery —."

4. Examiner states: "A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawing correction in reply to this Office Action. However, formal correction of the noted defect may be deferred until after the examiner has considered the proposed drawing correction. Failure to timely submit the proposed drawing correction will result in the abandonment of the application."
5. Examiner states: "Claim 8 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claim has not been further treated on the merits."
6. Examiner states: "Claims 1-7 and 9-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear what is being claimed in claim 1 since directed to an apparatus but no specific apparatus limitations are set forth. Claims 2, 4, 6-7, 9-14, and 17 are unclear because they appear to be claiming only a portion of the apparatus for their base claim instead of the entire apparatus as required. It is unclear what further limitations are being claimed by claims 2, 10 and 17. Claim 2 is also unclear because it is unclear if all the parameters are being claimed to be measured or only one from the group. The use of a Markush type claim is suggested. The limitation "other more advanced chemical/material analysis techniques as described in the prior art" is clearly not specific. It is unclear what is meant by "capital goods" in claims 3 and 5. I.E. how do they differ from noncapital goods? There is no proper antecedent for "said capital goods, sensors, and recording device" in claim 5 line 1, claim 15, line 1; and claim 16, line 1. In claim 5, line 2 "the surface" lacks proper antecedent. Claim 6, 15 and 16 are unclear because no means for doing the alternatives is set forth. It two different means with no

alternative selection two different claims should be used. It is unclear what is meant by efficient and elevated in claim 7. Use of such and such as limitations, as in lines 2-3 therein make unclear whether a general or the particular device are being claimed. It is unclear how the "external hostile environment" as in claim 9 can be an apparatus limitation. It is unclear what is meant by "special" in line 2. There is no proper antecedent for "said environmental substance" in claim 11, line 1. It is unclear what is meant by "extreme". There is no proper antecedent for "the environment" in claim 12. Qualifier limitations such as "when" as in claims 11 and 14 are clearly not specific. Similarly "especially" as in claim 14, line 1 is not specific. Limitations such as "and/or" as in the last line of claims 15 and 16 are clearly not specific. In claim 15, line 4 "said" should be detected. In claim 16, line 5 "said" should be -a hard-. Use of "such as" limitations as in claim 17 and parenthetical limitations as in claim 17 leads to vagueness as to the extent of what is actually being claimed."

7. Examiner states: "Claim 7, 12, 15-16 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 7 and 15-16 should each be written in single sentence format. In claim 12, line 1 "chose" should be -chosen-. In line 3 of claims 15 and 16 "the" should be deleted. Appropriate correction is required."
8. Examiner states: "The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the A to D converters, signal conditioning devices and data saving means of claim 4, solid state memory of claim 6 and isolating material of claim 9 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered."

9. Examiner states: " A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office Action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance. Applicant is required to submit a proposed drawings correction in reply to this Office action. However, formal correction of the noted defect may be deferred until after the examiner has considered the proposed drawing correction. Failure to timely submit the proposed drawing correction will result in the abandonment of the application."
10. Examiner states: "The specification must be amended if necessary to describe any proposed drawing correction."
11. Examiner states: " The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The particular solid state memories of claim 13 do not appear to be set forth on page 9, lines 1-3 or elsewhere in the specification. The hermetic sealing of claim 15 does not appear to be set forth on page 9, lines 12-15 or elsewhere in the specification. The radiation isolation material of claim 16 likewise is not set forth on page 9 or elsewhere. Extreme heat in excess of 100°C monitoring of claim 11 likewise does not appear to be set forth."
12. Examiner states: " Claims 1-2 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Moslehi US 5,270,222."
13. Examiner states: " Claims 3-7 and 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moslehi in view of (Renken et al. US 5,967,661 cited by applicant or Melcher US 5,015,951). Moslehi does not disclose attaching sensors, recording device and energy source

to a surface of the capital good (semiconductor wafer) being monitored. However it is well known to incorporate such features into semiconductors and thus they obviously could have been in the system of Moslehi especially in view of the teaching of incorporation of sensors or sensing structure on material in either Renken et al (note especially Fig. 9) and Melcher. Such would obviously ease measuring. The various electronic components and memory systems, etc. appear to be all well known of general utility and could thus obviously have been incorporated thereinto. Isolation from external hostile environments is a known expedient to protect the equipment and get more accurate measurements. One of ordinary skill would have been able to monitor in liquid environments since techniques for monitoring such environments appear to be well known.”

14. Examiner states: “The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicants disclosure. The cited references show measuring during manufacturing, and/or were cited by applicant.”
15. Examiner states: “Siedel et al. US 2002/0073386 A1, not prior art discloses a semiconductor die manufacture method using noninvasive measuring but not claim an apparatus as herein.”

AMENDMENT

Specification:

1. Please insert the following new paragraph at page 7, line 5, as the initial paragraph immediately following “SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION”:

///